

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on July 15, 2004 by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner rejected claims 1-17. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action mailed July 15, 2004 and also render all currently pending claims at issue patentably distinct over the references of record.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

A. Hartel in view of Crabill et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 12-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,454,074 (Hartel) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,265,024 (Crabill et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites a method of window management on a display, *inter alia*, including the step of opening and displaying a window containing a graphical overview of information related to a selected checklist, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

Independent Claim 12 is directed to a program product comprising, *inter alia*, instructions executable by a computer to display a user-selectable list of a plurality of checklists, each checklist having at least one user-selectable task, wherein at least one task of the at least one user-selectable task is associated with a synoptic page containing a graphical overview of information relating to said task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

Independent Claim 14 recites a method of presenting a computerized checklist on a display comprising, *inter alia*, receiving an input indicating a selected task from the plurality of tasks to be selected; determining whether an associated graphical overview should be displayed, based on the selected task, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist.

Hartel relates to an electronic checklist system to provide a checklist interface unit that allows the flight crew to access and execute both normal and non-normal checklists. The Examiner acknowledges that Hartel does not disclose synoptic information as a graphical overview of information wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist, but alleges that Crabill et al. makes up for these deficiencies. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Crabill et al. discloses a system and process for providing systematic, updated, weather information from the ground to the pilot of an aircraft. However, nowhere does Crabill et al. teach or suggest displaying a window containing a graphical overview of information related to a selected checklist, as recited in claim 1. Moreover, Crabill et al. does not teach the association of the synoptic page, with at least one user-selectable task of a checklist, wherein the synoptic page contains a graphical overview of information relating to the task and the graphical overview is not a checklist, as recited in claims 12 and 14. In fact, there is no mention at all of linking a checklist to a graphical overview of information.

Hence, neither Hartel nor Crabill et al. disclose (or even remotely suggest) displaying a graphical overview related to a checklist as recited in independent Claims 1, 12 and 14.

Claims 2-7 depend on claim 1, claim 13 depends from claim 12, and claim 16 depends from claim 14. Therefore, Applicants rely on the above arguments for these claims as well.

B. Hartel in view of Crabill et al. in further view of Southgate

The Examiner rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable by Hartel in view of Crabill et al. in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,561,757 (Southgate).

Independent Claim 8 recites a method of window management on a display device for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks, said display device having a first display presented thereon, said first display having a frame layout having a first window therein, said method comprising, *inter alia*, determining whether a synoptic window containing a graphical overview of information that is associated with said task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist, and if so, displaying the synoptic window associated with said task while the reduced window is displayed.

As previously mentioned, neither Hartel nor Crabill et al. disclose (or even remotely suggest) displaying a graphical overview related to task on a checklist, as recited in claim 8. Southgate relates to a method and apparatus for managing the display of multiple windows in a computer user interface and discloses using overlapping and/or tiled windows, however, Southgate does not make up for the deficiencies of Hartel and Crabill et al.


Claims 9-11 depend from claim 8, therefore, these claims rely on the arguments presented above.

In view of the aforementioned arguments, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is therefore earnestly requested by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to further discuss the above-identified patent application, the Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (480) 385-5060.

Respectfully submitted,



Cindy H. Kwacala
Registration No. 47,667

Dated 8/12/04

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, P.C.
Customer No. 29906